



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

10/1

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/970,453	10/02/2001	Shulamit Eyal	20174C-002410US	9637
20350	7590	01/24/2005	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			COOK, LISA V	
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER				
EIGHTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			1641	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/970,453	EYAL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lisa V. Cook	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,7 and 10-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,7 and 10-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/18/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment Entry

1. Applicants' Response to the Office Action mailed April 26, 2004 is acknowledged (paper filed 11/1/04). In response to Amendment filed therein claim 1 was modified. Claims 2, 5-6, 8-9 and 14-18 have been canceled at Applicants request.
2. Currently, claims 1, 3-4, 7, and 10-13 are pending and under consideration.
3. Objections and/or rejections of record not reiterated below have been withdrawn.

OBJECTIONS MAINTAINED

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the examiner on form PTO-892 or Applicant on PTO-1449 has cited the references they have not been considered.
5. The information disclosure statement filed 1/31/02 has been considered as to the merits prior to first action.
6. The supplemental information disclosure statement filed 6/18/04 has been considered as to the merits prior to final action.

Oath/Declaration

7. A new oath or declaration is required because provisional application number 60/237,937 filed 10/3/00 is not included and the corrected citizenship for inventor Eyal is not initialed and dated. The wording of an oath or declaration cannot be amended.

If the wording is not correct or if all of the required affirmations have not been made or if it has not been properly subscribed to, a new oath or declaration is required. The new oath or declaration must properly identify the application of which it is to form a part, preferably by application number and filing date in the body of the oath or declaration. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

Applicants are presently pursuing the listed inventors for a new Declaration and will promptly file the new Declaration. Until the new Declaration is received and approved, the objection is maintained.

Specification

8. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See page 9 line 1. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. This attempt to incorporate subject matter into the patent by reference is improper because PTO policy does not permit the PTO to link to any commercial sites since the PTO exercises no control over those organizations, views or accuracy of the information contained on those outside sites. Appropriate correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01.

Applicant has modified the embedded hyperlink by removing <http://www.> and replaced the wording with the world wide web at. However, this modification is not acceptable. The cited passage continues to refer to a hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code, which is not permissible. Accordingly, they are maintained.

Applicant has not addressed items 9 and 10 below, accordingly the objections are maintained.

9. The use of several trademarks is noted in this application. They should be capitalized wherever they appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks. (For example, see pages 22,- YOYO-1).

Claim Objections

10. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 13 the word “an” appears to be missing. Step (A) line 5-6 read “parameter is [an] integrated peak are”. Appropriate correction is required.

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION NECESSITATED BY AMENDMENT

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 1 and dependent claims 3, 4, 7, 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. Claim 1 is vague and indefinite because it appears to recite a contradiction. In line 1, the characteristic parameter of an analyte is recited to be *independent of the flow velocity of the analyte*. However in line 2 the same characteristic parameter is *influenced or dependent on the velocity of the analyte*. Is the characteristic parameter dependent or independent of the analyte velocity? Appropriate correction is required.

B. Claim 1 is vague and indefinite because it is not clear as to what is being measured. Is the method detecting “the characteristic parameter of the analyte”? This is not clear because a definitive correlative relationship between the method steps and the preamble is not included. Claim 1 step C, determines a velocity component and the characteristic parameter but does not relate the measurements such that the characteristic parameter of the analyte is detected.

C. In claim 1 step C the limitation “velocity component of the analyte” is vague and indefinite because there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Presently the claims read on the determination and elimination of a “velocity component” in step (c), however no velocity component appears to have been measured or detected a prior. Please correct appropriately.

D. Claims 7 and 10 are vague and indefinite because they depend on canceled claims 6 and 9, respectively. Appropriate correction is required.

REJECTIONS MAINTAINED

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

I. Claims 1, 3, and 4 (previously claims 1-5 and 8-9) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,613,512) or Kopf et al. (US Patent #6,524,790).

Kopf-Sill et al. disclose methods and microfluidic devices to measure reactants and reaction products while considering velocity. See column 1 line 64 through column 2 line 23. Reactants and products with different velocities (characteristics of an analyte) are measured in a microfluidic channel. See column 2 lines 36-37 and lines 57-58.

In one embodiment the fluid samples are transported from a first position to a second position by electroosmotic flow (claim 4). See column 6 lines 15-18. The time dependent data generated is processed to include baseline subtraction and masking for accurate measurements of the analyte of interest (normalizing and considering velocity). See column 1 lines 64-67 and column 22 lines 18-42.

Multiple detection positions/zones are taught at two different time points in figure 1. See figure 1 Time=t2 and Time>t2 (time difference measurement). The time difference and velocity are utilized in a equation to accurately measure the characteristic of interest in the analyte (claims 8 and 9). See column 5 line 11 through column 6 line 43. The various reactants and products can be assessed serially (individually) or simultaneously in the methods (claim 5). See column 2 lines 34-35.

Kopf-Sill et al. teach the step of normalizing or eliminating the velocity component in reaction measurements. See column 5 lines 55-62 and column 8 lines 10-22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

II. Claim 7 (previously claims 6-7) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,613,512) or Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,524,790) in view of Squire et al. (Journal of Microscopy, 197(2) 2/2000, 136-149).

Please see Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,613,512) or Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,524,790) as set forth above.

Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,613,512) or Kopf et al.-Sill (US Patent #6,524,790) differ from the instant invention in failing to teach acousto-optic modulators.

However, Squire et al. teach methods for measuring fluorescence with wave acoustic-optic modulators placed in a series. This configuration analyzed multiple data sets simultaneously and distinctly. See abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use acoustic-optic modulators as taught by Squire et al. in either method of Kopf-Sill et al. (6,613,512 or 6,524,790) because Squire et al. taught that "standing wave acoustic-optic modulators provide a means of modulating a continuous wave laser in a sinusoidal manner at high frequencies.

A number of these [lasers] can be employed in series to simultaneously modulate the excitation light of individual frequencies, their differences, and sums." See page 139 figure 2 and 2nd column last paragraph.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize these lasers in order to detect multiple frequencies simultaneously. Therein evaluating several analytes.

III. Claims 10-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,613,512) or Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,524,790) in view of Armstrong et al. (Cytometry, 40:102-108, 2/2000).

Please see Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,613,512) or Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,524,790) as set forth above.

Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,613,512) or Kopf et al.-Sill (US Patent #6,524,790) differ from the instant invention in failing to teach oligonucleotide detection including nucleotide measurements.

However, Armstrong et al. teach this limitation. Their methods evaluate PCR probes that are linked to fluorescent molecules and measured by flow cytometry. See abstract. The method detects individual nucleotides from individual nucleotide fluorescence peaks. See figures 2, 3, and 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use detect oligonucleotides and the nucleotides which make up the oligonucleotides as taught by Armstrong et al. in either method of Kopf-Sill et al. (6,613,512 or 6,524,790) because Armstrong et al. taught that genetic diversity is exhibited in disease and drug response and they can be effected by a single nucleotide difference/change/variant. See abstract.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant contends that the patents to Kopf-Sill (US Patent #6,613,512) and Kopf-Sill et al. (US Patent #6,524,790) do not anticipate the instant invention because they do not disclose the measuring of a characteristic parameter of an analyte within a fluid flow channel at a plurality of locations along the fluid flow channel. This argument was carefully considered but not found persuasive because both patents disclose analyte measurement in a continuous flow channel while measuring a signal indicative of the analyte (characteristic parameter) at various time points (plurality of locations along the fluid flow channel). Since the analyte is in constant motion, the measurement of the signal it generates over time represents a plurality of locations within the flow channel. For example see, US Patent #6,524,790 – figure 1, 11, and 21 as well as column 3 line 53 through column 4 line 52 and US Patent #6,613,512 figure 1 as well as columns 3 line 24 through column 4 line 55.

Applicant argues that Kopf-Sill discloses the determination of time zero as the beginning of electroendoosmosis therefore an initial time point measurement is needed. This argument was carefully considered but not found persuasive because Kopf-Sill discloses not only the measurement of time zero but include assay procedures with time up to eight hours (figures 16 and 17). Also, see figure 11, wherein experimental data for a PKA assay is measured from time zero to 60 seconds. Further, a reference is not limited to its working examples, but must be evaluated for what it teaches those of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Boe*, 355 F.2d 961, 148 USPQ 507 (CCPA 1966). *In re Chapman*, 357 F.2d 418, 148 USPQ 711 (CCPA 1966).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Kopf-Sill as a whole provide for only a single detector for each fluid flow channel) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

With respect to the rejections under 35 USC 103(a), Applicant contends that the additional references do not cure the deficiencies of Kopf-Sill. Kopf-Sill et al. have been addressed above. Therefore the rejections are maintained.

15. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1641

16. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 1641 – Central Fax number is (571) 273-8300, which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week. In the event Applicant would like to fax an unofficial communication, the Examiner should be contacted for the appropriate Right Fax number.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa V. Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, can be reached on (571) 272-0823.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lisa V. Cook

Lisa V. Cook

Patent Examiner

Art Unit: 1641

Remsen 3C-59

(571) 272-0816

Long

LONG V. LE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

1/19/05